



ΕΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ ΔΗΜΟΚΡΑΤΙΑ
Α Δ Ι Π
ΑΡΧΗ ΔΙΑΣΦΑΛΙΣΗΣ ΚΑΙ ΠΙΣΤΟΠΟΙΗΣΗΣ
ΤΗΣ ΠΟΙΟΤΗΤΑΣ ΣΤΗΝ ΑΝΩΤΑΤΗ ΕΚΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΗ

HELLENIC REPUBLIC
HQA
HELLENIC QUALITY ASSURANCE
AND ACCREDITATION AGENCY

Accreditation Report for the Undergraduate Study Programme of:

Philology

Institution: University of the Peloponnese

Date: 9/2/2019

ΑΡΙΣΤΕΙΔΟΥ 1 & ΕΥΡΥΠΠΙΔΟΥ, 105 59 ΑΘΗΝΑ
Τηλ.: +30 210 9220944, FAX: +30 210 9220143
Ηλ. Ταχ.: adipsecretariat@hqa.gr Ιστότοπος: <http://www.hqa.gr>

1, ARISTIDOU ST., 105 59 ATHENS, GREECE
Tel.: +30 210 9220944, Fax: +30 210 9220143
Email: adipsecretariat@hqa.gr Website: www.hqa.gr



Επιχειρησιακό Πρόγραμμα
Ανάπτυξη Ανθρώπινου Δυναμικού,
Εκπαίδευση και Διά Βίου Μάθηση
Με τη συγχρηματοδότηση της Ελλάδας και της Ευρωπαϊκής Ένωσης



Report of the Panel appointed by the HQA to undertake the review of the
Undergraduate Study Programme of Philology of the **University of
Peloponnese** for the purposes of granting accreditation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Part A: Background and Context of the Review	4
I. The Accreditation Panel.....	4
II. Review Procedure and Documentation	5
III. Study Programme Profile	8
Part B: Compliance with the Principles	9
Principle 1: Academic Unit Policy for Quality Assurance	9
Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes	12
Principle 3: Student-centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment	14
Principle 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification	16
Principle 5: Teaching Staff.....	18
Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support.....	20
Principle 7: Information Management	22
Principle 8: Public Information	24
Principle 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Internal Review of Programmes.....	25
Principle 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Internal Review of Programmes.....	25
Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes	26
Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes	26
Part C: Conclusions	27
I. Features of Good Practice	27
II. Areas of Weakness.....	27
III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions	27
IV. Summary & Overall Assessment	28

PART A: BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT OF THE REVIEW

I. The Accreditation Panel

The Panel responsible for the Accreditation Review of the Undergraduate Study Programme of the Higher Education Institution named: Philology comprised the following three (3) members, drawn from the HQA Register, in accordance with the Law 4009/2011:

1. Professor Alexandra Georgakopoulou-Nunes (Chair)
King's College London, United Kingdom

2. Professor Timothy Duff
University of Reading, United Kingdom

3. Assoc. Professor Alicia Moralez Ortiz
Murcia University, Spain

II. Review Procedure and Documentation

Please refer briefly to the Panel preparation for the study programme review, as well as to the documentation provided and considered by the Panel. State the dates and of the site visit and describe the visit schedule and the meetings held. Feel free to mention any additional information regarding the procedure, as appropriate.

The Panel considered the following documentation before the site visit:

The HQA standards and guidelines for quality accreditation of undergraduate programmes.

The external evaluation report for the Department of Philology, University of Peloponnese, conducted in 2011.

The Proposal for the Accreditation of the Philology Undergraduate Study Programme of the University of Peloponnese.

The questionnaire of the Internal Evaluation of the Undergraduate Programme in Philology, University of Peloponnese.

The decision of the Quality Assurance Unit in the institution (16/7/2018) with reference to the Internal Evaluation of the undergraduate Programme of Philology.

The internal evaluation report of the Undergraduate Programme of Philology.

The findings regarding the Internal Evaluation of the Undergraduate Programme of Philology.

Eight (8) accompanying Appendices to the Internal Evaluation.

Quality indexes of the Department of Philology, University of Peloponnese for the academic years 2015-2016 and 2016-2017.

The panel were also provided with a mapping grid for the accreditation of study programmes and the Template for the Accreditation report.

The panel's briefing by the HQA took place on Monday 4 February 2019 and the site visit (Kalamata, Peloponnese) on Tuesday 5 February 2019. (Dr Morales Ortiz was unable to attend but took part in the 1st meeting of the day by teleconferencing).

During the site visit, additional documents were made available to the panel, including an up to date presentation of the department and its programmes of study (printed and in usb), a sample of student essays and examination scripts and information about: the role and activities of the Committee of Research Design; students' evaluation of modules; the students' Practical Training; the department's organization of academic and other outreach events and a document setting out the new system of Academic Advisors. The documentation provided to the Panel both before and during the site visit was deemed to be appropriate, thorough, detailed and meticulously organized. This facilitated the Panel's task and it was much appreciated.

During the site visit, the following meetings were held:

Meeting with the Deputy Rector/President of MODIP Associate Professor Asterios Tsiaras & the Head of the Department, Associate Professor Eleni Koutrianou. This was a welcome meeting which included a short overview of the Undergraduate Programme: history, academic profile, current status, strengths and possible areas of concern.

Meeting with OMEA & MODIP representatives.

OMEA representatives: Professor Giorgos Andreiomenos, Professor Andreas Markantonatos, Associate Professor Eleni Koutrianou, student Georgia Andreou.

MODIP representatives: Assistant Professor Panagiota Karavia, ETEP Member Vassiliki Gionna, Papastratakou Anna, Papaporfiriou Anthoula.

This was to discuss the degree of compliance of the Undergraduate Programme to the Standards for Quality Accreditation and to review students' assignments, thesis, exam papers & examination material.

Meeting with teaching staff members

Teaching staff members: Professor Giorgos Andreiomenos, Associate Professor Eleni Koutrianou, Assistant Professor Dimitra Delli, Assistant Professor Sofia Kapetanaki, Assistant Professor Eleni Volonaki, Assistant Professor Maria Drossinou, Assistant Professor Maria Xesternou, EDIP Member Nikolaos Soumas.

This was to discuss professional development opportunities, mobility, workload, evaluation by students; competence and adequacy of the teaching staff to ensure learning outcomes; link between teaching and research; teaching staff's involvement in applied research, projects and research activities directly related to the programme; possible areas of weakness.

Meeting with current students: To discuss students' satisfaction with their study experience and Department/Institution facilities; student input in quality assurance; priority issues concerning student life and welfare.

Meeting with graduate students: To discuss their experience of studying at the Department and their career path.

Meeting with Administrative staff members: I. Moutafi, Chr.-M. Nikolaidou, K. Dedousi, G. Katsou Teaching staff members: Professor Giorgos Andreiomenos, Associate Professor Eleni Koutrianou. This was part of the panel's visit of classrooms, lecture halls, libraries, other facilities (computer rooms, libraries, etc.) with the aim of evaluating facilities and learning resources to ascertain that the learning materials, equipment and facilities are adequate to ensure a successful provision of the programme.

Meeting with employers, social partners AP Employers/social partners: Ioannis Bougas, Head

Master of 5th Lyceum, Kalamata; Fotios Bougas, Private School Owner; Eleftheria Kyriakopoulou, Administrative Staff, Region of Peloponnese; Panagiotis Petropoulos, Director of Education, Region of Peloponnese; Ioannis Solaris, Secondary Education Philologists' Coordinator; Dimitrios Vergopoulos, Deputy Mayor, Kalamata; Vassilios Bazanis, Philologist.

This was to discuss the relations of the Department with external stakeholders from the private and the public sector.

A de-briefing meeting was held amongst the Panel members, so as to discuss on the outcomes of the visit and begin drafting the oral report.

We subsequently held a meeting with OMEA & MODIP representatives: Professor Giorgos Andreiomenos, Professor Andreas Markantonatos, Associate Professor Eleni Koutrianou, student Georgia Andreou.

MODIP representatives: Assistant Professor Panagiota Karavia, ETEP Staff Vassiliki Gionna, Anna Papastratakou, Anthoula Papaporfiriou

The purpose of this meeting was to bring up and discuss certain points/findings which needed further clarification.

Finally, we held a closure meeting with the Vice-Rector/President of MODIP, the Head of the Department, and OMEA & MODIP representatives to provide an informal presentation of the AP key-findings.

III. Study Programme Profile

Please provide a brief overview of the Study Programme with reference to the following: history, academic remit, duration of studies, qualification awarded, employment opportunities, orientation challenges or any other key background information. Also you may provide a short description of the home Department and Institution, with reference to student population, campus or any other facts, as deemed appropriate.

The UG Programme of Philology has been in operation since 2005 and is part of the University of the Peloponnese (established in 2003). The stated aims of the Department are: (i) to cultivate and promote knowledge of classical, modern Greek and non-Greek literature and linguistics, the study of the philosophical currents which affect their evolution; (ii) to provide students with sound training for their scholarly and professional career; (iii) to organise postgraduate studies so as to produce graduate with specialised knowledge of the subjects offered at the Department; (iv) to contribute to the study of the influence of Byzantium on Greek and European culture, and of the elements that form its universal character in the modern world. The duration of the undergraduate study in Philology is 4 years (8 semesters). From semester 5 onwards, students choose one of the following two pathways: Classical Philology or Byzantine & Modern Greek Philology. Students need 240 ECTS to graduate. Following the external evaluation of 2011, the programme has been restructured so as to reduce the number of courses (from 65 to 48 currently; or 50 for students who choose 2 optional modules instead of a Dissertation). It has also been expanded to cover areas of linguistics (a recent appointment in linguistics is notable), digital humanities and pedagogical courses for the teaching of students with special needs. This has resulted in an exciting mixture of more traditional philological subjects with current inter-disciplinary subjects of philology with digital approaches to language and text.

In the academic year 2017-2018, the department had 13 permanent members of staff (incl. 3 Professors), 2 teaching associates and 2 technical staff, 2 admin staff, 1 post-doctoral fellow and 10 PhD students.

The buildings in which the department is housed and the facilities are excellent, especially by standards of Greek universities: pristine, beautifully renovated, boasting a state of the art lecture/conference hall, 9 well-equipped classrooms, 1 IT lab, 1 room with workstations, and a library (spread out in 2 wings) with substantial printed holdings and adequate access to online repositories. This state-of-the-art infrastructure is partly owed to generous donations from the local community which takes pride in 'hosting' the university in general and the specific department in particular. The department has cultivated strong links with stakeholders and social partners in Kalamata (and beyond) as this is evidenced by its numerous outreach activities, including a highly successful Summer School for the teaching of Greek language, history and culture, and 3 Labs (Ancient Rhetoric and Dramatic Art; Diachronic Study of the Greek language and literature; Comparative Grammatology & Theory of Literature).

PART B: COMPLIANCE WITH THE PRINCIPLES

Principle 1: Academic Unit Policy for Quality Assurance

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD APPLY A QUALITY ASSURANCE POLICY AS PART OF THEIR STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT. THIS POLICY SHOULD EXPAND AND BE AIMED (WITH THE COLLABORATION OF EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS) AT ALL INSTITUTION'S AREAS OF ACTIVITY, AND PARTICULARLY AT THE FULFILMENT OF QUALITY REQUIREMENTS OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES. THIS POLICY SHOULD BE PUBLISHED AND IMPLEMENTED BY ALL STAKEHOLDERS.

The quality assurance policy of the academic unit is in line with the Institutional policy on quality, and is included in a published statement that is implemented by all stakeholders. It focuses on the achievement of special objectives related to the quality assurance of study programmes offered by the academic unit.

The quality policy statement of the academic unit includes its commitment to implement a quality policy that will promote the academic profile and orientation of the programme, its purpose and field of study; it will realise the programme's strategic goals and it will determine the means and ways for attaining them; it will implement the appropriate quality procedures, aiming at the programme's continuous improvement.

In particular, in order to carry out this policy, the academic unit commits itself to put into practice quality procedures that will demonstrate:

- a) the suitability of the structure and organization of the curriculum;*
- b) the pursuit of learning outcomes and qualifications in accordance with the European and the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education;*
- c) the promotion of the quality and effectiveness of teaching;*
- d) the appropriateness of the qualifications of the teaching staff;*
- e) the enhancement of the quality and quantity of the research output among faculty members of the academic unit;*
- f) ways for linking teaching and research;*
- g) the level of demand for qualifications acquired by graduates, in the labour market;*
- h) the quality of support services such as the administrative services, the Library, and the student welfare office;*
- i) the conduct of an annual review and an internal audit of the quality assurance system of the undergraduate programme(s) offered, as well as the collaboration of the Internal Evaluation Group (IEG) with the Institution's Quality Assurance Unit (QAU);*

Study Programme compliance

The Department of Philology has a clearly articulated and ambitious quality policy, which embraces a commitment to developing a culture of quality, improvement and transparency. Working in close cooperation with the University's Quality Assurance Unit (MODIP), the Department has in place a robust and clear procedure for the quality assurance of its undergraduate programme in Philology.

The Department has a clear committee structure. The organisation of the programme is the responsibility of the Board of Studies for Undergraduate Programmes, which reviews the structure and effectiveness of the undergraduate programme annually. It meets at least 3 times per year and reports to the Department's Internal Evaluation Group (OMEA).

The OMEA, the membership of which includes senior members of the Teaching and Research Staff (DEP / EP) and a student representative, is responsible for assuring the quality of the programme of studies and for compiling the Internal Evaluation Report (i.e. the self-evaluation of the programme), which is submitted to the University's Quality Assurance Group (MODIP). In compiling its self-evaluation, the OMEA takes into account the results of questionnaires, which students are invited to fill in for each module they take; the OMEA also reports results of the questionnaires to the Department's General Assembly, which consists of all teaching staff and two student representatives.

There is also a Research Planning Committee, an Erasmus+ / International Relations Committee, and a Committee overseeing the Practical Training (Πρακτική Άσκηση), both of which report to the General Assembly.

The structure of the undergraduate programme is logical and clearly set out and communicated to students in the Guide to Undergraduate Studies. All students take a set of 24 core modules in their first two years of study. Students then specialise in either Classical Philology or Byzantine and Modern Greek Philology in their final two years, and take a set of 12 compulsory modules in their particular pathway, plus 10 core modules. Students also take 2 optional modules in their third year, one of which may be a Practical Training involving internships with local schools, cultural organisations and companies and local government, and in their final year take either a further 2 (optional) modules, which may be outside their programme, or write an 8.000–12.000 word dissertation on a subject of their choice under the guidance of a supervisor.

The structure and content of the programme, and its learning outcomes, are fully consistent with national and international norms. The programme is distinctive, in comparison to other similar programmes nationally and internationally, in its incorporation of modules on the teaching of school pupils with special needs and on the use of new technology in teaching and research in philology. The department makes use of an e-learning platform, e-class, and also assists students in reaching their full potential by offering tutorial, remedial classes (often run by teaching volunteers).

The support and administrative services are effective, though understaffed and under-resourced. The library is adequate, has reasonable opening hours, offers access to the most important e-resources and databases in the field of philology, and allows students to borrow books.

The Department is particularly to be applauded for its plans to introduce, from academic year 2018–19, a system of Academic Advisors (Academic Tutors). All members of teaching staff will serve as Academic Advisors, and each student will be assigned, on entry, to a single Academic Advisor, drawn from the members of the teaching staff, who will oversee their progress throughout their degree and provide advice and support.

Panel judgement

Please tick one of the following:

Principle 1: Institution policy for Quality Assurance	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

The panel recommends that the Department build on its practice of seeking student feedback on each module through questionnaires, by instituting a system by which students are informed of the results of the feedback and of any action taken by the department in response.

Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD DEVELOP THEIR UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES FOLLOWING A DEFINED WRITTEN PROCESS WHICH WILL INVOLVE THE PARTICIPANTS, INFORMATION SOURCES AND THE APPROVAL COMMITTEES FOR THE PROGRAMME. THE OBJECTIVES, THE EXPECTED LEARNING OUTCOMES, THE INTENDED PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS AND THE WAYS TO ACHIEVE THEM ARE SET OUT IN THE PROGRAMME DESIGN. THE ABOVE DETAILS AS WELL AS INFORMATION ON THE PROGRAMME'S STRUCTURE ARE PUBLISHED IN THE STUDENT GUIDE.

Academic units develop their programmes following a well-defined procedure. The academic profile and orientation of the programme, the objectives, the subject areas, the structure and organisation, the expected learning outcomes and the intended professional qualifications according to the National Qualifications Framework for Higher Education are described at this stage. The approval or revision process for programmes includes a check of compliance with the basic requirements described in the Standards, on behalf of the Institution's Quality Assurance Unit (QAU).

Furthermore, the programme design should take into consideration the following:

- *the Institutional strategy*
- *the active participation of students*
- *the experience of external stakeholders from the labour market*
- *the smooth progression of students throughout the stages of the programme*
- *the anticipated student workload according to the European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System*
- *the option to provide work experience to the students*
- *the linking of teaching and research*
- *the relevant regulatory framework and the official procedure for the approval of the programme by the Institution.*

Study Programme compliance

The design, oversight and development of the Undergraduate Programme of Studies is the responsibility of the Department's Board of Studies for Undergraduate Programmes, which reports to the annually to the OMEA. The content of the programme is reviewed regularly to ensure that it is up-to-date both in terms of content and of pedagogical methods, the last review having taken place in 2015. The current programme of studies was established also on the basis of the recommendations contained in the External Evaluation which took place in 2011.

The Department shares in the institutional strategy of the University of the Peloponnese to promote innovation, strengthen the competitiveness of its programmes, and incorporate the latest teaching methods. The Department has built close contacts with external stakeholders including the regional administration, the regional association of teachers of philology in secondary education, libraries, archives and publishing houses. These contacts are promoted both through provision of the Practical Exercise module and through the series of events, lectures and conferences which the Department organises. The Department plans to seek the involvement of such external stakeholders in the design of the programme and evaluation of its success in attaining its goals.

The framework for the approval and review of the programme is clearly articulated as set out in section 1, above. Student views are sought through module questionnaires, and a student representative sits on the Internal Review Group.

The programme is fully compatible with the ECTS system, and designed to provide students with a smooth progression as they move from the more introductory and foundational modules which predominate in the first two years of study, to the more specialised and research-led modules in the final two years; the optional modules and dissertation further distinguishes the second half of the programme from the first. In addition, the final year of the programme offers students the opportunity to undertake work experience in local schools, archives and other external stakeholders through the Practical Training module.

Panel judgement

Principle 2: Design and Approval of Programmes	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

The department should continue to seek, where feasible, the contribution of external stakeholders in the shaping of its programmes, and of the attributes considered desirable in its graduates.

The department might consider further ways of soliciting student views and involvement in the design of the programme through e.g. a staff-student liaison committee.

The department might consider extending opportunities to philology students to take optional modules in the Department of History, Archaeology and Cultural Resources Management.

Principle 3: Student-centred Learning, Teaching and Assessment

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD ENSURE THAT THE UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES ARE DELIVERED IN A WAY THAT ENCOURAGES STUDENTS TO TAKE AN ACTIVE ROLE IN CREATING THE LEARNING PROCESS. THE ASSESSMENT METHODS SHOULD REFLECT THIS APPROACH.

Student-centred learning and teaching plays an important role in stimulating students' motivation, self-reflection and engagement in the learning process. The above entail continuous consideration of the programme's delivery and the assessment of the related outcomes.

The student-centred learning and teaching process

- *respects and attends to the diversity of students and their needs, enabling flexible learning paths;*
- *considers and uses different modes of delivery, where appropriate;*
- *flexibly uses a variety of pedagogical methods;*
- *regularly evaluates and adjusts the modes of delivery and pedagogical methods aiming at improvement*
- *regularly evaluates the quality and effectiveness of teaching, as documented especially through student surveys;*
- *reinforces the student's sense of autonomy, while ensuring adequate guidance and support from the teaching staff;*
- *promotes mutual respect in the student - teacher relationship;*
- *applies appropriate procedures for dealing with students' complaints.*

In addition :

- *the academic staff are familiar with the existing examination system and methods and are supported in developing their own skills in this field;*
- *the assessment criteria and methods are published in advance;*
- *the assessment allows students to demonstrate the extent to which the intended learning outcomes have been achieved. Students are given feedback, which, if necessary is linked to advice on the learning process;*
- *student assessment is conducted by more than one examiner, where possible;*
- *the regulations for assessment take into account mitigating circumstances*
- *assessment is consistent, fairly applied to all students and carried out in accordance with the stated procedures;*
- *a formal procedure for student appeals is in place.*

Study Programme compliance

Based on the comprehensive documentation we were provided with and our meetings during the site visit, we were satisfied that the programme is fully compliant with the principles of student-centred learning, teaching and assessment, as listed above. Overall, students are provided with ample opportunities for reflecting on, engaging in and evaluating the learning process. It is also worth noting that since the external evaluation of 2011, attendance of students in classes has risen considerably. We were particularly impressed with the 'family atmosphere' of the department, the evidence of a growing nurturing and pastoral culture, the students' high levels of reported satisfaction, their apparent respect for the department's site

(both staff and students take pride in preserving the facilities and there was notably no graffiti in sight) and their willingness to engage in constructive dialogue with their teachers about matters of teaching and assessment. It is also notable that, despite the fact that the majority of classes take the form of lectures and that the assessment is, by and large, based on written exams, there is extensive use of multi-media facilities and (non-assessed) coursework aimed at promoting student engagement, reflection and autonomy, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, at providing the students with formative feedback. In addition, the quality and effectiveness of teaching is regularly evaluated. The commitment of the programme to the pastoral and mentoring aspects of the student experience is evidenced in the current (as of this academic year) provision of personal advisors (tutors) in conjunction with the institution putting in place mechanisms and facilities for counselling and welfare services. The department is sensitized to issues of student diversity: this is attestable by the good provision of access facilities to the building and in the integration into the curriculum of pedagogical courses for teaching students with learning disorders and neuro-divergence.

Panel judgement

Principle 3: Student- centred Learning, Teaching an Assessment	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

The Department ought to continue to seek ways in which to increase students' participation in the evaluation of modules and teaching and in which to follow up and act on evaluation results (perhaps by communicating to students at the beginning of each academic year how their feedback on specific modules has been taken on board).

The Department could consider alternative, more interactional modes of content delivery to complement the current format of lecture mode.

Processes for dealing with student appeals and complaints should be put in place.

The institution in collaboration with the department should seek ways in which to involve alumni and appropriate non-academic stakeholders in consultative discussions regarding the remit and philosophy of the programme as well as its potential links with the local community. Preparation of collaborative bids for competitive research grants should be considered as part of consolidating the department's impact-oriented and outreach profile and identity.

Principle 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD DEVELOP AND APPLY PUBLISHED REGULATIONS COVERING ALL ASPECTS AND PHASES OF STUDIES (ADMISSION, PROGRESSION, RECOGNITION AND CERTIFICATION).

Institutions and academic units need to put in place both processes and tools to collect, manage and act on information regarding student progression.

Procedures concerning the award and recognition of higher education degrees, the duration of studies, rules ensuring students progression, terms and conditions for student mobility should be based on the institutional study regulations. Appropriate recognition procedures rely on institutional practice for recognition of credits among various European academic departments and Institutions, in line with the principles of the Lisbon Recognition Convention.

Graduation represents the culmination of the students' study period. Students need to receive documentation explaining the qualification gained, including achieved learning outcomes and the context, level, content and status of the studies that were pursued and successfully completed (Diploma Supplement).

Study Programme compliance

The programme is fully compliant with this principle, as explicated above. The provision of mobility through Erasmus exchanges with a wide range of European Institutions is notable. The provision of a Practical Training which affords work placement opportunities for students in the local community (e.g. libraries, museums, schools, local newspapers) and in which up to 80% of the student community participates is highly successful and constitutes an instance of good practice. There is also good practice in the provision of e-class (that includes module guides, bibliography, lecture notes, etc.) and in the supervision and assessment of dissertations (the Panel noted an impressively wide range of topics in previous dissertations), including the use of the tool Turnitin to detect plagiarism. Finally, there is good provision of remedial, tutorial language classes that provide extra-support to students especially in Latin.

Panel judgement

Principle 4: Student Admission, Progression, Recognition and Certification	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

The department should explore ways in which to publicise its strong mobility programme and encourage students to take up the available opportunities.

It is reassuring that the modules are currently structured so as to reflect their level of difficulty but the department should continue to explore ways in which to communicate to students clearly the balance of independent reading requirements with contact hours per module.

Principle 5: Teaching Staff

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD ASSURE THEMSELVES OF THE QUALIFICATIONS AND COMPETENCE OF THE TEACHING STAFF. THEY SHOULD APPLY FAIR AND TRANSPARENT PROCESSES FOR THE RECRUITMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OF THE TEACHING STAFF.

The Institutions and their academic units have a major responsibility as to the standard of their teaching staff providing them with a supportive environment that promotes the advancement of their scientific work. In particular, the academic unit should:

- *set up and follow clear, transparent and fair processes for the recruitment of properly qualified staff and offer them conditions of employment that recognize the importance of teaching and research;*
- *offer opportunities and promote the professional development of the teaching staff;*
- *encourage scholarly activity to strengthen the link between education and research;*
- *encourage innovation in teaching methods and the use of new technologies;*
- *promote the increase of the volume and quality of the research output within the academic unit*
- *follow quality assurance processes for all staff members (with respect to attendance requirements, performance, self-assessment, training etc.);*
- *develop policies to attract highly qualified academic staff;*

Study Programme compliance

The department currently consists of 13 members of teaching and research staff (DEP); two additional members have recently been elected. There are also 5 postdoctoral teaching and research staff, and 4 members of laboratory and special technical teaching staff. The procedure for the appointment of new staff follows the requirements laid down by the relevant law. Teaching staff are appropriately qualified, and are accessible and responsive to students; all staff have regular weekly office hours.

All staff are encouraged to be research active, and the department has a very good record of research publication especially in the last 5 years. The teaching load of 2 modules per semester is comparable to that at other institutions internationally in the humanities, as is the staff-student ratio of roughly 1:18. The department has a system to provide staff with a semester of research leave roughly every three years. There is some financial support for staff to participate in international conferences, with funding directed particularly at staff at the more junior ranks.

There is a strong link between research and teaching, as the programme of studies includes modules deriving from the research of teaching staff. The department offers Masters and PhD programmes, and has three Laboratories (research centres): The Laboratory for Ancient Rhetoric and Dramatic Art, the Laboratory for the Diachronic Study of Greek Language and Grammar, and the Laboratory for Comparative Grammatology and the Theory of Literature, all of which organise lectures, events and conferences, to which undergraduate students are invited.

Staff are encouraged to take advantage of Erasmus+ mobility and an impressive number of staff have done so.

Staff performance is regularly evaluated through student questionnaires, the results of which are analysed by the International Evaluation Group (OMEA).

Panel judgement

Principle 5: Teaching Staff	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	X
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

That the University considers whether there is scope and resources for the development of continuing professional development opportunities, especially for inexperienced staff.

That the University seeks to appoint staff in under-represented areas in the programme of study.

Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD HAVE ADEQUATE FUNDING TO COVER TEACHING AND LEARNING NEEDS. THEY SHOULD –ON THE ONE HAND- PROVIDE SATISFACTORY INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES FOR LEARNING AND STUDENT SUPPORT AND–ON THE OTHER HAND- FACILITATE DIRECT ACCESS TO THEM BY ESTABLISHING INTERNAL RULES TO THIS END (E.G. LECTURE ROOMS, LABORATORIES, LIBRARIES, NETWORKS, BOARDING, CAREER AND SOCIAL POLICY SERVICES ETC.).

Institutions and their academic units must have sufficient funding and means to support learning and academic activity in general, so that they can offer to students the best possible level of studies. The above means could include facilities such as libraries, study rooms, educational and scientific equipment, information and communications services, support or counselling services.

When allocating the available resources, the needs of all students must be taken into consideration (e.g. whether they are full-time or part-time students, employed or international students, students with disabilities) and the shift towards student-centred learning and the adoption of flexible modes of learning and teaching. Support activities and facilities may be organised in various ways, depending on the institutional context. However, the internal quality assurance ensures that all resources are appropriate, adequate, and accessible, and that students are informed about the services available to them.

In delivering support services the role of support and administrative staff is crucial and therefore they need to be qualified and have opportunities to develop their competences.

Study Programme compliance

As explained above, the facilities attached to the programme are outstanding. The programme is very well supported by a library with extensive printed holdings and adequate electronic resources, two rooms with workstations, an IT lab for the teaching of a compulsory module on the use of technologies in teaching and research in Philology, a large lecture hall with AV facilities and 9 state of the art classrooms. The students report high levels of satisfaction with the facilities on offer.

Panel judgement

Principle 6: Learning Resources and Student Support	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

The programme should be supported by a tutorial system and by student welfare and counselling services and it is pleasing to see that arrangements to this effect are currently being put in place.

Student accommodation is missing but it is good to see that the departments of the School in collaboration with local community stakeholders are actively pursuing a solution to this issue.

Library opening hours have been extended since the external evaluation of 2011 but naturally the students would welcome a further extension. These arrangements are beyond the 'powers' of the department but it is notable that the department is aware of this need and seeking ways in which to improve the situation further.

Principle 7: Information Management

INSTITUTIONS BEAR FULL RESPONSIBILITY FOR COLLECTING, ANALYSING AND USING INFORMATION, AIMED AT THE EFFICIENT MANAGEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMMES OF STUDY AND RELATED ACTIVITIES, IN AN INTEGRATED, EFFECTIVE AND EASILY ACCESSIBLE WAY.

Institutions are expected to establish and operate an information system for the management and monitoring of data concerning students, teaching staff, course structure and organisation, teaching and provision of services to students as well as to the academic community.

Reliable data is essential for accurate information and for decision making, as well as for identifying areas of smooth operation and areas for improvement. Effective procedures for collecting and analysing information on study programmes and other activities feed data into the internal system of quality assurance.

The information gathered depends, to some extent, on the type and mission of the Institution. The following are of interest:

- *key performance indicators*
- *student population profile*
- *student progression, success and drop-out rates*
- *student satisfaction with their programme(s)*
- *availability of learning resources and student support*
- *career paths of graduates*

A number of methods may be used for collecting information. It is important that students and staff are involved in providing and analyzing information and planning follow-up activities.

Study Programme compliance

The department has a very good system in place for gathering and updating information regarding key performance indicators, student progression, success and drop-out rates, student satisfaction with their programme(s) and availability of learning resources and student support.

Student satisfaction surveys are regularly conducted and the OMEA (Internal Evaluation Committee) works in collaboration with the MODIP to analyze, communicate the information obtained to the Department in order to introduce the appropriate improvements.

The Computer System of Quality Assurance of the University centralizes all the data. They are published in the MODID website

(<http://modip.uop.gr/index.php/ektheseis/statistika-aksiologisis-mathimaton>)

Panel judgement

Principle 7: Information Management	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	X
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

In collaboration with the University, to set up a system for gathering and processing information about student population profile and career paths of graduates.

In collaboration with the MODIP, to conduct regularly teaching and administrative staff satisfaction surveys.

Principle 8: Public Information

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD PUBLISH INFORMATION ABOUT THEIR TEACHING AND ACADEMIC ACTIVITIES WHICH IS CLEAR, ACCURATE, OBJECTIVE, UP-TO-DATE AND READILY ACCESSIBLE.

Information on Institution's activities is useful for prospective and current students, graduates, other stakeholders and the public.

Therefore, institutions and their academic units provide information about their activities, including the programmes they offer, the intended learning outcomes, the qualifications awarded, the teaching, learning and assessment procedures used, the pass rates and the learning opportunities available to their students, as well as graduate employment information.

Study Programme compliance

The programme's webpages are up to date and easy to navigate. The programme's handbook is thorough and informative, as well as readily accessible. The e-class contains up to date module guides, lecture notes and bibliographies. There is some variability per module in the level and detail of information provided. The Department publishes complete online information about the programme including a complete description of all courses with syllabus, teaching methodology, objectives, criteria for assessment, bibliography etc. There is also available extensive information on Department activities, teaching staff's CVs, research, seminars and conferences, Erasmus, useful administrative information and documentation and useful links, and other services provided by the Department and by the University. In general, the information provided in the website is clear, up-to-date and readily accessible.

Panel judgement

Principle 8: Public Information	
Fully compliant	
Substantially compliant	X
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

It is recommended to add more information on the website regarding the Department's Quality System, including provision of information on internal annual evaluations.

Principle 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Internal Review of Programmes

INSTITUTIONS SHOULD HAVE IN PLACE AN INTERNAL QUALITY ASSURANCE SYSTEM FOR THE AUDIT AND ANNUAL INTERNAL REVIEW OF THEIR PROGRAMMES, SO AS TO ACHIEVE THE OBJECTIVES SET FOR THEM, THROUGH MONITORING AND AMENDMENTS, WITH A VIEW TO CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT. ANY ACTIONS TAKEN IN THE ABOVE CONTEXT SHOULD BE COMMUNICATED TO ALL PARTIES CONCERNED.

Regular monitoring, review and revision of study programmes aim to maintain the level of educational provision and to create a supportive and effective learning environment for students.

The above comprise the evaluation of:

- the content of the programme in the light of the latest research in the given discipline, thus ensuring that the programme is up to date;*
- the changing needs of society*
- the students' workload, progression and completion;*
- the effectiveness of the procedures for the assessment of students*
- the students' expectations, needs and satisfaction in relation to the programme;*
- the learning environment, support services and their fitness for purpose for the programme*

Programmes are reviewed and revised regularly involving students and other stakeholders. The information collected is analysed and the programme is adapted to ensure that it is up-to-date. Revised programme specifications are published.

Study Programme compliance

The programme has robust processes in place for regular monitoring, review and revision of study programmes. Four committees incl. the Board of Studies for Undergraduate Programmes oversee this process. The recent internal evaluation document demonstrates good collation of information, an excellent working relationship between MODIP and OMEA and a constructive process of reflexivity and internal dialogue amongst staff, students and stakeholders. Any updates of the programme of study have complied with recommendations of the last external evaluation.

Panel judgement

Principle 9: On-going Monitoring and Periodic Internal Review of Programmes	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes

PROGRAMMES SHOULD REGULARLY UNDERGO EVALUATION BY COMMITTEES OF EXTERNAL EXPERTS SET BY HQA, AIMING AT ACCREDITATION. THE TERM OF VALIDITY OF THE ACCREDITATION IS DETERMINED BY HQA.

HQA is responsible for administrating the programme accreditation process which is realised as an external evaluation procedure, and implemented by a committee of independent experts. HQA grants accreditation of programmes, with a specific term of validity, following to which revision is required. The accreditation of the quality of the programmes acts as a means of verification of the compliance of the programme with the template's requirements, and as a catalyst for improvement, while opening new perspectives towards the international standing of the awarded degrees.

Both academic units and institutions participate in the regular external quality assurance process, while respecting the requirements of the legislative framework in which they operate.

The quality assurance, in this case the accreditation, is an on-going process that does not end with the external feedback, or report or its follow-up process within the Institution. Therefore, Institutions and their academic units ensure that the progress made since the last external quality assurance activity is taken into consideration when preparing for the next one.

Study Programme compliance

The programme is fully compliant with the regular external evaluation principle. It has also been updated in accordance with the recommendations of the last external evaluation (2011).

Panel judgement

Principle 10: Regular External Evaluation of Undergraduate Programmes	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

Panel Recommendations

PART C: CONCLUSIONS

I. Features of Good Practice

- Excellent working relationship between MODIP and OMEA.
- Excellent facilities, site, learning resources and support.
- Family atmosphere, nurturing and pastoral culture, sensitivity to students' different needs.
- Quality and breadth of curriculum. Innovative aspects, combining traditional philology subjects with digital humanities and special education courses.
- Receptiveness and willingness to adapt and restructure on the basis of feedback from external evaluation of 2011.
- Outreach, impact activities, strong links with local community and non-academic stakeholders, including a summer school and 3 labs.
- Practical Training of students in collaboration with the local community.

II. Areas of Weakness

- Lack of student appeals and complaints' procedure
- The Erasmus+ mobility programme is not taken by many students
- Lack of information about current and alumni students vital to the further development of the programme and consolidation of its reputation: e.g. applicant profile, motivations; career destinations.
- Scope for promotion of the programme to 16+ students with a view to increasing quality of intake.
- Follow up mechanisms to students' evaluation of courses and teaching.
- Modes/methods of teaching and assessment.

III. Recommendations for Follow-up Actions

- Processes for dealing with student appeals and complaints should be put in place.
- The Department could consider alternative, more interactional modes of content delivery to complement the current format of lecture mode.
- The university in collaboration with the department should seek ways in which to involve alumni and appropriate non-academic stakeholders in consultative discussions regarding the remit and philosophy of the programme as well as its potential links with the local community.
- The department should build on its practice of seeking student feedback on each module through questionnaires by instituting a system by which students are informed of the results of the feedback and of any action taken by the department in response.

- The department should explore ways in which to publicise its strong mobility programme and encourage students to take up the available opportunities.
- The University should consider whether there is scope and resources for the development of continuing professional development opportunities, especially for inexperienced staff.
- Information about prospective, current and alumni students should be collated (e.g. applicant profile, motivations for study, career destinations).

IV. Summary & Overall Assessment

The Principles where full compliance has been achieved are: 1,2,3,4,6,9,10

The Principles where substantial compliance has been achieved are: 5,7,8

The Principles where partial compliance has been achieved are: None

The Principles where failure of compliance was identified are: None

Overall Judgement	
Fully compliant	X
Substantially compliant	
Partially compliant	
Non-compliant	

**The members of the Accreditation Panel
for the UGP Philology
of the University of Peloponnese**

Name and Surname

Signature

Prof Alexandra Georgakopoulou-Nunes,
King's College London, United Kingdom

Prof Timothy Duff,
University of Reading, United Kingdom

Assoc. Prof Alicia Morales Ortiz
University of Murcia, Spain